\ '			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
√ Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	10/824,790	O'DONNELL, EDWARD A.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andrew Wright	3617	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence addre	ss
THE REPLY FILED 10 March 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.			
ITEL REPT FILED INVALIDATION TALES OF SECTION AND THE STATES OF SECTION AND THE	g a Notice of Appeal. To avoid aba an amendment, affidavil, or other peal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mu date of the final rejection. shory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the and SIX MONTHS from the mailing date or ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE F ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE F (and the corresponding amount of the feat and the corresponding amount of the feat shatters peefed for reply originally set in the shatters peefed for shatters are shatters.	ndonment of this applicies evidence, which places e with 37 CFR 41.31; or st be filed within one of the final rejection, whichever is the final rejection.  IRST REPLY WAS FILED to a) and the appropriate extension is final Office actions or (2) as	the (3) a the following s later. In no NITHIN TWO tion fee have fee under 37 s set forth in (b)
earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	-		
NOTICE OF APPEAL  2. The reply was filled after the date of filing a Notice of App was filed on	41.37 must be filed within two mon CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal time period set forth in 37 CFR 41	iths of the date of filing to of the appeal. Since a N .37(a).	otice of
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection     (a) They raise new issues that would require further or	onsideration and/or search (see NO	ef, will <u>not</u> be entered be DTE below);	cause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE bell (c) They are not deemed to place the application in beautiful appeal; and/or	ow); etter form for appeal by materially i	reducing or simplifying t	he issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)		ejected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.	121. See attached Notice of Non-C	Compliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(:	s):		
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be the non-allowable claim(s).	allowable if submitted in a separate	e, timely filed amendme	nt canceling
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pr The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	)  will not be entered, or b)  vovided below or appended.	will be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) widnawn from consideration: AFFIDANT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	•		
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, I because applicant failed to provide a showing of good a and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	ind sufficient reasons why the aπid	avit or other evidence is	necessary
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filin entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary.	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under app ary and was not earlier presented.	eai and/or appellant rail: See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a ).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanat REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered b			ce pecause:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s			
13. Other: See Continuation Sheet.	A.	WEIGHT 2	1/
	ANDREW	A ?	24/05

Continuation of 13. Other: The proposed amendment, even if compliant with 37 CFR 1.121, would not overcome the 35 USC 112, 1st Paragraph, rejection. It is suggested that applicant amend the specification to add language to the effect of: "The means for selectively maintaining the mast section at a substantially stable position includes..." Such language would clearly identify the corresponding structure of the means-plus-function claim language and overcome the rejection.